

Remarks

Claims 1-11, 15, and 17-23 are pending. Claims 12-14 and 16 are canceled and new Claims 21-23 are added in this Response.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 2 and 4 have been amended to recite that the acts are performed by a WEB client and that the same WEB client performs each of those acts. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in Fig. 6B and the accompanying text in the Specification at page 9, lines 18-30. The amendment to Claims 1, 2 and 4 is a clarifying amendment that, for the reasons noted below, is not necessary to distinguish the references cited by the Examiner.

Claim 15 has been rewritten as an independent claim.

New Claims 21-23 are computer readable medium counterparts to Claims 1, 6 and 15, respectively. Support for computer programming embodiments may be found in the Specification at page 16, lines 7-16.

Rejections Based On Leveridge

Claims 1-3 were rejected under Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Leveridge (20020178070).

Claim 1 recites transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie. The Examiner asserts Leveridge teaches this limitation at paragraphs 0047, 0052-0056, and 0059, explaining only that "client sends first request to gateway for a cookie valid for the URL." This assertion is not correct.

Leveridge teaches an authentication procedure for clients accessing a web site through a "gateway server." The passages in Leveridge cited by the Examiner describe the use of a "token cookie" to authenticate clients/users to the gateway server. The clients do not request the token cookie (or any other cookie) from the server. On the contrary, Leveridge explicitly teaches that the token cookie is sent to the client in response to "a document request (URL)." Leveridge paragraph 0055.

From the client's perspective in Leveridge, the gateway server is simply an access point through which it must pass to retrieve the requested document/URL. The gateway server is not a cookie store from which cookies are obtained *by the client* and then transmitted *by the client* to a different server. In Leveridge, the client makes only

one request -- a "document request (URL)" -- and that single request is routed to the URL through the gateway server. In Claim 1, by contrast, the WEB client makes two different requests to two different devices -- a request for a cookie from a "remote computer" and a subsequent request for a resource to the WEB server. Leveridge does not teach any such "dual request" procedure.

Leveridge does not teach all of the limitations of amended Claim 1 and, therefore, the rejection of Claim 1 its dependent claims should be withdrawn.

*Rejections Based On Qian*

Claims 4-17 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Qian (20020032731) in view of Callaghan (20020007317). Claims 18-20 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Qian in view of Callaghan and Silverbrook (6813039).

With regard to Claim 6, the Examiner asserts without any explanation that Qian teaches a means for receiving a cookie from a first WEB client, a means for receiving a request for a cookie from a second WEB client, and a means for responding to the request by transmitting the cookie to the second WEB client. This assertion is not correct.

Qian describes a "coordination server" and "group browsers" that facilitate so-called group web browsing. This coordination server, or one of the group browsers, or one of the group browser controllers apparently includes "cookie manager computer code" that creates "a temporary cookie jar that houses all cookies created during [a group browsing] session." Qian paragraph 0078. Although the description in Qian is less than a model of clarity, it is clear enough that the clients in a group browsing session do not request cookies from the cookie jar and, accordingly, the cookie jar does not respond to any such requests to send cookies to the clients. Indeed, it is not at all clear in Qian that the cookies in the cookie jar are even received from the clients themselves, as opposed to being received from the web site(s) browsed during the group session.

With regard to Claim 15, the Examiner states only that "Claims 12-16 contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claims 1 and 6 and are therefore rejected under the same basis." Office Action page 5.

Claim 1 was rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Leveridge.

Claim 15 was rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Qian in view of Callaghan. The rejection of Claim 1, therefore, is irrelevant to the rejection of Claim 15.

Claim 15 recites several limitations not found in Claim 6. Claim 15, for example, recites two WEB clients each operable to, in response to receiving a cookie from a WEB server, transmit the cookie to a remote computer, and the remote computer is operable to transmit to a requesting one of the WEB clients one or both cookies that are responsive to the request. The Examiner's reference to Claim 6, therefore, is wholly insufficient to support the rejection of Claim 15.

Finally, Applicants wish to emphasize that it is the Examiner who carries the burden of establishing a prima facie case of anticipation and/or obviousness. With due respect, the examining corps at the Patent Office seems to have somehow got the notion over the last couple years that this burden may be discharged by the simple expedient of quoting from the claims and citing parenthetically to a reference, without explaining how the reference might somehow be deemed to actually teach or suggest the elements of the claim. And so it is in this case. Those passages in Leveridge and Qian cited by the Examiner have no apparent relevance to the limitations recited in the claims. The Applicants are left to guess at the Examiner's thinking – to speculate on some possible relevance when none is apparent. If, as must be the case, the Examiner has actually formulated in her mind a connection between what is claimed and what is taught by the reference, it should be no great hardship to articulate that connection in the Office Action.

If the Examiner continues to feel the cited references anticipate or make obvious any or all of the claims, then she is respectfully requested to specifically point out **and explain** those passages in each reference that support her position. Absent such a showing, the claims should be allowed.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the pending Office  
Action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston

Reg. No. 35,974

Phone: 208-433-1991 x204